

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
8 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

9 JOSEPH P. CUVIELLO, et al.,

No. C 06-05517 MHP

10 Plaintiffs,

11 **MEMORANDUM & ORDER**

12 v.

13 CITY OF OAKLAND, et al.,

**Re: Plaintiffs' Motion for De Novo Review
of Magistrate Recommendation, Request for
Expansion of the Record, and Objections to
the Scheduling of an Evidentiary Hearing
for Plaintiffs' Motion for Sanctions**

14 Defendants.
15

16 This action arises from plaintiffs' efforts to film the treatment of animals during the Ringling
17 Brothers Circus's annual exhibitions at the Oakland Coliseum. The detailed factual background is
18 set forth in prior orders and reports. See Docket Nos. 47, 76 & 180. The parties stipulated to a
19 modified preliminary injunction, which was approved by the court on August 1, 2008. Docket
20 No. 81.

21 On October 24, 2008, following the 2008 circus, plaintiffs filed a motion for an order to
22 show cause why defendants should not be held in contempt and sanctioned. On January 21, 2009,
23 the court referred the motion to Magistrate Judge Chen, pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure
24 72(b) and Civil Local Rule 72-3, for a hearing and a Report and Recommendation on plaintiffs'
25 motion. Docket No. 133. A hearing was held before the magistrate judge on March 11, 2009. On
26 March 26, he entered an order setting a May 15, 2009, evidentiary hearing but limiting the scope of
27 the hearing. Docket No. 180. Plaintiffs noticed two separate motions challenging the magistrate
28 judge's rulings.

1 Plaintiffs' motions are premature. The motion before the magistrate judge is a motion for
2 sanctions based on purported contempt of court by defendants. Federal magistrate judges have no
3 power of contempt themselves but must certify the facts to a judge of the district court. Bingman v.
4 Ward, 100 F.3d 653, 657 (9th Cir. 1996) (citations omitted). For that reason, this court has referred
5 the matter to the magistrate judge for a Report and Recommendation only. The order challenged by
6 plaintiffs deals with the manner in which the magistrate judge intends to hear evidence and reach
7 conclusions to inform his Report and Recommendation. There is no grounds for this court to review
8 in a piecemeal manner decisions of the magistrate judge pertaining to the proceedings before him.
9 Once the magistrate judge has entered his Report and Recommendation, the parties will have an
10 opportunity to raise any objection to it or to the procedures used by the magistrate judge to reach his
11 conclusions.

12 For the foregoing reasons, plaintiffs' motions are DENIED in their entirety, without
13 prejudice to renewal following entry of the magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation.

14
15 IT IS SO ORDERED.

16
17 Dated: May 5, 2009

18 
19 _____
20 MARILYN HALL PATEL
21 United States District Court Judge
22 Northern District of California
23
24
25
26
27
28